



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

17

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/635,748

08/05/2003

Robert J. Bolender

SYNA-20030715-01

9656

7590 09/18/2007
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

BECK, ALEXANDER S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,748	BOLENDER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alexander S. Beck	2629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alexander S. Beck.

(3) John Wagner.

(2) Joel Youngs.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 11 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 14, 27, 39 and 58.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,924,789 to Bick.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Alexander A Beck
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

With prosecution closed for the instant application, applicant's representatives requested a telephonic interview to discuss proposed amendments in an effort to overcome the prior art made of record and expedite prosecution. However, no proposed amendments were received prior to the interview and the applicant's representatives instead argued the rejections of record. Applicant's representatives argued that elements 27-30 of Bick cannot read on the limitation "keymat" as presently claimed because Bick discloses that element 17 is a "keymat". Additionally, it was argued that an engineer would not find elements 27-30, which includes electroluminescent back light layer 29, to read on a "keymat"; rather, an engineer would look to a flexible rubber material for a "keymat".

Examiner disagreed and re-emphasized the response to arguments found on pages 10 and 11 in the final Office action mailed on July 11, 2007. The specification of the instant application discloses expressly "a keymat 210 that is deformable to actuate switch sensors 214." (Specification at p. 8, ll. 10-13.) Bick discloses wherein elements 27-30 are deformable to actuate switch sensors 33a and 33b. (Bick at col. 2, ln. 35 - col. 3, ln. 29.) As such, it is the examiner's position that elements 27-30 of Bick read on a "keymat" as presently claimed because it is deformable to actuate switch sensors. Again, there is just no disclosure in the claim language or specification that would prohibit elements 27-30 of Bick to be read on a "keymat".